

THE MAXIM VIOLATION ON MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW ‘Selebriti Pengganda Simpati’

Submitted by:

Ester Okta Alfina (NIM. 13020111130079)

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A (NIP. 19640814 199001 001)

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2016**

ABSTRAK

In interacting with other people, Cooperative Principle may be done in order to make a conversation run well and smoothly. However, there are chances when speakers have to violate a maxim in order to reinforce the self-esteem of others and to avoid offence and embarrassment. The purpose of the study is to find out the kinds of maxim violation done by the speakers on ‘Mata Najwa’ talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims. The study used Non-Participant Observation Method to collect the data and *Padan* Method to identify the kinds of maxims violated by the speakers on ‘Mata Najwa’ talk show. The result of the study shows that there are fifteen utterances violating Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner maxims. The motivation behind the speakers violating the maxim is mostly because they want to show politeness and keep other’s self-esteem.

Keywords: Maxim violation, Motivation, Mata Najwa, *Talk show*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In society, if we want to build a good conversation, the relation between the speaker and listener should be created cooperatively. The cooperation of making a

good conversation between the speaker and listener is well known as Cooperative Principle (Yule, 1996:36). It describes how people interact with each other. This rule should be done in order to make a conversation among them run well.

However, language is useless without meaning. Language actually has explicit and implicit (contextual) meanings. In relation to implicit meaning, there are four maxims (maxim of Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner) that should be fulfilled to make an ideal conversation. If speakers do not purposefully fulfill certain maxims, there will be maxim violation. Grice (1989 : 28) said that when the speaker does not fulfill or obey the maxims, the speaker is said to violate the maxims.

‘Mata Najwa’ is one kind of talk shows broadcasted by Metro TV. In the “*Selebriti Pengganda Simpati*” episode, Mata Najwa invited some celebrities like, Addie MS, Ahmad Dhani, and Tompi, to be interviewed about their political interest. The concept of the talkshow in this episode was inviting and interviewing some celebrities employed by parties to increase votes they can gain in the election. In this episode, the invited guests did some maxim violations when being interviewed by Najwa. The purpose of the study is to identify maxim violation done by the guests of Mata Najwa talk show and the motivation behind the guests violating the maxims.

1.2 Scope of the Study

In this project, the writer focuses the study on maxim violation on Mata Najwa talk show.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify maxim violation done by the speakers in ‘Mata Najwa’ talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Conversational Maxim

Grice (1989 : 28) argues that in order to implement the Cooperative Principles, the listener and speaker must obey four Conversational Maxims. They are maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. We have to cooperate with the maxims if we want to make our conversation run smoothly. Each of the maxims will be explained as follows:

2.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity requires the speaker to make contribution that is as informative as is required. When someone contributes more information than is required, then it can be said that he/she violated Quantity maxim. The speaker does not allow to make his contribution neither shorter nor longer than is required.

Widdowson (2007:58) described maxim of Quantity in the conversation below:

Q: Could you tell the court what you did on the morning of February 10th?

A: I was woken by alarm clock at 7.15 in the morning. I got out of bed. I put on my slippers and went to the bathroom and turned on the cold tap over the washbasin, took my toothbrush and cleaned my teeth (Widdowson, 2007:58).

From the conversation above we know that the speaker was only asked about what speaker was doing in the morning of February 10th, yet the speaker provided too much information for the answer. By giving this answer, it can be implied that the speaker was trying to hide the real activities he was doing during the morning of February 10th. It is also clearly stated to us that the conversation above violated the maxim of Quantity.

2.1.2 Maxim of Quality

Quality maxim requires utterances that have enough evidence and are true. In this maxim, speakers do not allow to make contribution containing lies or untruth.

Leech (1983:125) has an example of this:

A: Geoff has just borrowed your car

B: Well, I like THAT!

As in the conversation above, it can be seen that actually B really hates the fact that Geoff has borrowed his car, yet B's answer is contrary to what he actually feels. This conversation violated maxim of Quality by saying something that is not true. Quality maxim requires the utterances that have enough evidence and are true.

2.1.3 Maxim of Relation

The concept of this maxim is by saying something that is relevant to the topic. This maxim requires relevance between the speaker and the hearer. Widdowson (2007:61) has an example of this maxim. It is a little conversation between a husband and wife getting ready to go out for an evening. The wife asks the husband.

Wife : how do you like my new hat?

Husband: very much.

Husband: looks nice

Husband: well, not sure it is quite your color.

Husband: it is ten past eight already.

The husband for some reasons at the end chose not to comply with the maxim of relation. There are some implicatures regarding his answers violating the maxim. Perhaps he actually hated the hat or he just became impatient since they were already late to go out.

2.1.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of Manner requires contribution that is clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous. Speakers are required to say things that avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression in order to not violate Manner maxim. There is an illustration from Kunjana (2007:57)

Daughter: Mom, I wanna go back to the town tomorrow.

Mother : I have already prepared in on the desk

This conversation involves a daughter who is still a student living in dormitory far away from her home and her mother. As we can see above, the daughter has an ambiguity of what she said. She did not just mean to inform her mother about her leaving but also she had intention to ask her mother for money yet she did not utter it well.

2.2 Motivation for Maxim Violation

One reason for disregarding the maxims is to assert territorial rights, so to speak, and to project one's self (Widdowson. 2007:64). Speakers tend to violate the maxims because they think it may cause offence, embarrassment toward others. They maintain good relations by a mutual respect for face and territorial rights of others. Widdowson (2007:64) stated that this kind of cooperation goes under the general name of politeness. There are chances when speakers have to violate the maxims because they just do not want to cause offence and undermine other's self-esteem. They choose to violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take the implicit meaning of what they said.

3. METHODOLOGY

The writer applies a descriptive qualitative method in this research as she describes how *Gudang Garam* represents the image of their products and their targeted customers through their advertisements' taglines by using presupposition and using reference. The data are in the form of written text, so it is suitable for this research as Polkinghorne stated that, "Qualitative method relies on linguistics rather than numerical data, and employing meaning-based rather than statistical forms of data analysis." (Elliot, R. and Timulak, L., 2005: 147).

This paper is a qualitative descriptive research. The data of this research are utterances of violated maxims produced by the speakers at Mata Najwa talk show broadcasted

nationally on Metro TV on 23 april 2014. I used the video "*Mata Najwa eps Selebriti Pengganda Simpati FULL version* - YouTube" downloaded via internet to explain maxim violation produced by the speakers.

This research used Descriptive Method to explain and describe the study deeply. I construed the phenomenon of maxim violation existing in the speakers' utterances through Griceian maxims. In addition, this research used non-participant observation method meaning that I did not involve in the conversation.

In collecting the data, I used Documentation Method in which the data were taken from the video downloaded from internet as the data source (<http://www.youtube.com>). After that, I used Note-Taking Technique to collect the data. The writer took utterances which contain maxim violation produced by the guests of 'Mata Najwa' talk show and classified the data based on four types of maxims.

To analyze the data, I used Reflective-Introspective Method to find out the motivation behind the maxim violation done by the guests of 'Mata Najwa' talk show. Pragmatic Identity Method or *Padan* Method was also used to identify the kinds of maxims violated by the speakers in 'Mata Najwa' talk show.

4. DISCUSSION

After watching this episode, I found fifteen utterances containing maxim violation done by the guests. Ahmad Dhani is the guests that has violated maxim the most. From his utterances, he violated Quantity and Quality maxim two times and Relation and Manner maxim three times. Meanwhile Tompi only once violated Quantity, Relation, and Manner maxim. Addie MS is the speaker mostly obeying the maxims. He only once violated Quantity and Manner maxim. In the data. there are four utterances containing violation of Quantity and Relation maxim, two utterances

of Quality maxim violation, and five utterances of Manner maxim violation. The followings are some of the data found.

4.1 Violation of Quantity Maxim

Quantity maxim requires contribution that is as informative as is required. When someone contributes more information than is required, then it can be said that he/she violated Quantity maxim. In the data, I found four utterances containing violation of Quantity maxim done by all the speakers. The following example shows violation of Quantity maxim that has been done by Addie MS.

- (1) Najwa: *“Apakah sekarang dengan Jokowi mau menjadi capres, Sikap anda (mendukung) masihsamasepertipilgublalu?*
That Jokowi will be a president candidate now, is your stance (to support Jokowi) still the same as the last governor election?
- Addie: *“Saya sebenarnya melihat Jokowi punya potensi ya (untuk menjadi presiden), jadi mungkin kita sudah dua term dengan pak SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) kita melihat ada masalah HAM, korupsi, dan yang lainnya, sementara pak SBY punya karakter yang santun, proper, nah kelihatannya orang (Indonesia) ingin keluar dari situasi yang stagnan ini.*
Actually, I see Jokowi has potency (to be a president), so maybe, we already had two terms (presidential period) with Mr. SBY, we see there are still human rights problems, corruption, and etc. Meanwhile Mr. SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) are polite, proper, so it seems that (Indonesian) people want to get out of this stagnant situation.

Based on the data above, we can see that Najwa only asked whether Addie still supports Jokowi or not. However, Addie answered too much than was required and even did not answer the actual question. Addie also switched the topic by talking about Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono eventhough Najwa did not ask about that. From the explanation above we know that Addie’s utterances violated Quantity maxim by answering too much than was required as he talked about Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono which is irrelevant to the topic.

By violating the maxim, Addie may want to reinforce Jokowi’s image and keep his good relation with Jokowi. The possible implicature is that his support for

Jokowi is not as much as his support for Jokowi in the last governor election. This can be proven from his utterance switching the topic into the answer that was not even being asked by Najwa.

4.2 Violation of Quality Maxim

Utterances that can be said violating Quality maxim are the ones that say something that is not true. Quality maxim requires utterances that have enough evidence and are true. I found two utterances violated Quality maxim done only by Ahmad Dhani. Here is one example of his utterances that has violated Quality maxim.

- (2) Najwa: *“Diberi janji untuk jadi menteri kalau dapat berapa persen (suara pemilu) PKB?”*
Given the promise to be a minister if PKB gets how many percent (in the election)?
Dhani: *“Oh tidak ada. Kalau PKB koalisinya berhasil saja dengan presiden yang mereka usung”*
Oh, nothing. If only PKB’s coalition succeeds with the president they carry.
Najwa: *“Akan menjadi menteri Ahmad Dhani?”*
Will you become a minister, Ahmad Dhani?
Dhani: *“Ya kalau Cak Imin menepati janjinya”*
Yes, if Cak Imin keeps his promise.
Najwa: *“Ada keraguan akan (Cak Imin) ingkarjanji?”*
Is there any doubt that (Cak Imin) will break the promise?
Dhani: *“Oh enggak, enggak”*
Oh, no.

When Dhani said that he would become minister if Cak Imin keeps his promise, we can see there is a doubt in Dhani that Cak Imin will keep his promise. Then when Najwa asked whether he was doubtful or not that Cak Imin would break his promise, he answered no. We can see from his utterances that he actually doubted that Cak Imin can keep the promise, yet he denied it at the end. In society, there is also a ‘common sense’ in politicians to make promises without realization. Dhani seems doubtful Cak Imin would keep his promise too. Dhani as the speaker violated maxim of Quality by answering the thing that is not in accordance with what he felt is true.

By saying 'no' at the end, Dhani broke the assumption that he doubted Cak Imin would keep his promise. He chose to violate Quality maxim because he wants to keep Cak Imin's reputation as a politician. Moreover Dhani is still employed in the party Cak Imin leads. Dhani seems to maintain Cak Imin's reputation and also his relation with Cak Imin as a working partner.

4.3 Violation of Relation Maxim

Relation maxim requires relevance between the speaker and the hearer. This maxim demands the speakers to be relevant to the topic that is being talked about. There are four utterances containing violation of Relation maxim in the data done by Ahmad Dhani and Tompi. One of the examples can be seen below.

- (3) Najwa: *"Kira-kira apa saja yang dilakukan Tompi untuk mendukung orang agar percaya pada sosok Gita Wiryawan?"*
Roughly, what are the things Tompi has done to support people to believe in Gita Wiryawan?
- Tompi: *"saya pikir Indonesia cuma perlu tau punya seseorang yang Bernama Gita Wiryawan dengan segala kapasitas yang dia punya."*
I think, Indonesia only needs to know a person named Gita Wiryawan with all the capacity he has.

From the conversation above, we can see that Tompi's answer is irrelevant to the topic that was being asked. He was asked about what support he has done to support Gita Wiryawan, yet his answer did not relevant to the topic. Tompi is supposed to give the answer which is related to the question like what kind of support he gives or what he has done to support Gita Wiryawan yet Tompi did not do that. It can be said that Tompi violated Relation maxim.

By violating Relation maxim, Tompi may not want to cause embarrassment on his own self because he may not do anything yet to support Gita Wiryawan. He chose to make an irrelevant answer because he actually wants to discover the truth of doing nothing to support Gita Wiryawan. Furthermore, he also has a good relation with Gita

Wiryawan for years, if Tompi really answers that he has not done anything yet to support Gita Wiryawan, it may ruin Tompi's image as a good friend of Gita Wiryawan.

4.4 Violation of Manner Maxim

Maxim of manner requires contribution that is clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous. Speakers are required to say things that avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression in order to not violate Manner maxim. In the data, Manner maxim is the most violated maxim by the speakers. I found five utterances containing violation of manner maxim done by all the speakers, as seen from the examples below.

- (4) Najwa: *"kalau capres usungan Golkar (Aburizal Bakrie) menarik hati tidak?"*
Is Golkar's president candidate (Aburizal Bakrie) appealing or not?
Tompi: *"kalau buatsaya tidak setuju ya, karena saya tidak melihat penyelesaian yang baik terhadap apa yang pernah dilakukan."*
For me, I do not agree, because I do not see a good solution for what he had done.
- (5) Najwa: *"Tetapi saya mau pastikan saja, berarti memang tidak ada Keuntungan komersil apapun (yang didapat dari partai)?"*
But I just want to make sure, so there is surely no commercial benefit (you get from the party)?
Dhani: *"Ya nggak adalah, paling uang jajan aja."*
Nothing, it is only pocket money.
Najwa: *"uang jajan tuh berapa sih?"*
How much is the pocket money?
Dhani: *"uang jajan ya lumayanlah buat makan sebulan"*
Yeah, pocket money that is enough for monthly meal.

Both of the examples above do not show clear statements. When Tompi was asked about Golkar's president candidate, Aburizal Bakrie, he said that he did not agree because he did not see a good solution for what Bakrie had done. His answer may cause people think of what Aburizal had done in the past. From his utterance, Tompi violated manner maxim by talking something that is not clear.

By doing so, Tompi may have motivation to keep the ethics by not talking about someone's past on the media. He did not give a clear statement about what

Bakrie had done because he may assume that people already know about that and also it is not good to talk about someone's disreputation on the media.

Meanwhile in data (5), Dhani was asked about the commercial benefit he got from the party. We can see Dhani did not give a clear statement about how many commercial benefit he got from the party. He said that it was only pocket money for monthly meal, but of course, everyone's monthly meal is different. Dhani's monthly meal as a public figure is certainly different from usual people. Here, Dhani did not mention clearly how much he got.

Dhani did it because it is not appropriate to mention the amount of his salary on the television. By violating manner maxim, Dhani also wants to keep his good relation with Cak Imin who has employed him on the party. If the amount of the money Dhani got from the party is not that much, it also can cause embarrassment on the party who paid him. The possible implicature is that the amount of the money Dhani got from the party is too big so it is not appropriate to talk about it on the television, or even less than people imagine about the income of an artist who is employed by a party.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper analyzed the conversational maxims that have been violated by the speakers in the talk show of 'Mata Najwa' talk show. The purpose of the study is to find out the kinds of maxim violation done by the speakers in 'Mata Najwa' talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims.

There are fifteen utterances containing maxim violation found in the talk show. The motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims is because they want to show politeness and keep other's pride or good image. They also do not want to cause offence and embarrassment by violating the maxims. Speakers choose to

violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take the appropriate implicature of what they said.

REFERENCES

- Grice, H. P. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hutomo, Antares. 2010. "Griceian's Maxims on Investigation Report (Case Study of Corruption in District Attorney of Demak)" S1 Thesis.Semarang: UniversitasDiponegoro.
- Ismail, Assaniyah. 2011. "Some Violations of Cooperative Principle in Ada Apa dengan Cinta" S1 Thesis.Semarang: UniversitasDiponegoro.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Rahardi, Kunjana. 2007. *Berkenalan dengan Ilmu Bahasa Pragmatik*. Malang: DIOMA.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Widanti, Retno. 2009. "Violations of Cooperative Principle in Morning Zone Program in Trax FM Semarang" S1 Thesis.Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2007. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G.1996. *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.